	Case 2:20-cv-02501-WBS-JDP Document 15 Filed 02/23/21 Page 1 of 2
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13	00000
14	
15 16	IVAN ESCOBAR, as an individual no. 2:20-cv-02501-WBS-JDP and on behalf of all others similarly situated,
17	Plaintiff, ORDER
18	v
19	CAPSTONE LOGISTICS, LLC, a
20	Delaware limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 50,
21	inclusive
22	Defendants.
23	00000
24	Plaintiff Ivan Escobar ("plaintiff") brought this
25	action against Capstone Logistics, LLC, asserting violations of
26	California Labor Code § 226(a) and California Labor Code § 2698,
27	and purporting to sue on behalf of himself and "[a]ll current and
28	and rapporting to the condition of mimoria and latin our end
	1

## Case 2:20-cv-02501-WBS-JDP Document 15 Filed 02/23/21 Page 2 of 2

former employees of Capstone Logistics in the state of California who were paid "Premium" wages at any time between May 13, 2019, through the present." (See Compl.) (Docket No. 1, at Ex. 1.)

Defendant Capstone Logistics removed the case to this court asserting original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2), the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, as well as supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367. (See Docket No. 1.) Plaintiff subsequently moved to remand the case. (See Mot. to Remand.) (Docket No. 7.) Defendants' opposition to plaintiff's motion focused solely on why plaintiff's case should remain in federal court based on the Class Action Fairness Act. (See Docket No. 11.) After reviewing his arbitration agreement, plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint ("FAC") which removed his class action claims and now only asserts claims under the Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code § 2968, et seq. (See generally FAC.) (Docket No. 12.)

Because defendants' opposition to plaintiff's motion to remand focused solely on class claims that are no longer present in plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, defendants are hereby ORDERED to file a supplemental response to plaintiff's Motion to Remand addressing whether this court has diversity jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims. Defendants shall file this supplemental response by February 26, 2021. Plaintiff may file a supplemental reply in support of his motion by March 2, 2021.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 23, 2021

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

28